

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 11 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Re: John C. Montagna et al. Attn: Group Art Unit 3612
Serial No. 10/696,342 Examiner Dennis H. Pedder
Filing Date 10/29/2003
For PULL OUT DRAWER SYSTEM October 2005 Amendment

Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450:

I certify that this correspondence is facsimile-transmitted
to the Patent and Trademark Office (571 273 8300) on 11 OCT 2005:

Christopher John Rudy: Christopher John Rudy Oct. 11, 2005.

Thank you for the 07/11/2005 Office action. In reply to that action, please reconsider and further examine the application and withdraw all rejections, which are respectfully, yet strenuously traversed. CLAIMS AMENDMENTS follow this introductory page.

This amendment more particularly points out and distinctly claims the invention, and is fully supported by the underlying specification with drawings, noting especially claim 27 for which support includes that found in the paragraph bridging pages 8-10; page 10, lines 13-18 and 19-22; and FIGS. 19-24. No new matter is added. Claims 1-4, 7-10, 15-18, 23-25, 27-30 and 32 remain.

Against the rejections under 35 USC 112, 1st and 2nd paras., claims 1-18 and 23-25 correctly were **TWICE ALLOWED**: the action's summary, block 5; and page 4, item 9. Even so, "inverted French F-channel," although proper, is now "first channel" (claims 1 et seq.) or "channel" (claims 23-25), and "inverted U-channel," even though properly not rejection grounds, is "second channel." For claims 27-30 and 32, claim 18 properly did not have this grounds of rejection; support for a ramp slide-in/slide-out accessory is found on page 4, lines 1-2; on page 9, line 21; and in FIG. 24.

Against the rejection under 35 USC 102(b) over Nydam et al., claim 27 now requires a slide-in/out accessory (drawer or ramp) between the two outside rails and below the noted top surface of the movable mounting frame. The cart 28 of Nydam et al. is above any corresponding top surface. Some drawers may have lids.

Against the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) over Nydam et al., in view of Johnson et al., Johnson et al. is nonanalogous art and cannot be applied; even if it could be, no suggestion clearly present in the prior art motivates the pertinent ordinary artisan to have slide-in/slide-out drawers or ramps between two outside rails and below said top surface of the movable mounting frame. Against the other Sec. 103(a) rejection, the ramp can slide in and out (support noted above). Nydam et al., Reed et al., and Ives et al., even in combination, do not suggest this but teach away, the latter two patents, nonetheless, also nonanalogous.

Dated: Oct. 11, 2005 A.D.

Attmt: Pages 2-7

Christopher John Rudy, PTO #31873
209 HURON AVE, PORT HURON MI 48060
Telephone (810) 982-4221